

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 04:30:11 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #261  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 15 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    261

Today's Topics:

                    license turnaround times..  
         Outsider's reaction to no-code license.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 1994 02:17:51 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!spool.mu.edu!mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-  
for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: license turnaround times..  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <199406142008.NAA16502@ucsd.edu>, William=E.=Newkirk% wrote:  
> just a tidbit...  
>  
> the last exam we did here was 5/21/1993 (a saturday).  
>  
> this was sent to the VEC via overnight express on 5/23 (monday).  
>  
> the VEC sent a card saying that session's paperwork was submitted on June 7.  
> this was about 10 days after they received the package (Memorial day - 5/31).  
>  
> this should mean that these folks should get their licenses abt September 9.  
> (figuring the FCC has to have 'em for about 12 weeks plus about 1 wk mailing).  
>  
> bill wb9ivr  
>

I took my tests the last weekend in February. I believe the VE's sent in the forms 1st of March. Myself, I'm still waiting on my ticket...

It's been around, what, 15 weeks I think...

<sigh> Soon...

--

Internet: dratzlaf@nyx.cs.du.edu

| \ |  
| \ |  
| \ | orby

"Leave the night-light on  
inside the birdhouse in your soul"--TMBG

-----  
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 04:14:32 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
ns.mcs.kent.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!  
mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Outsider's reaction to no-code license.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2tiro7\$8mp@charm.magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu>, Ron Jones (rj+@osu.edu) writes:

>were to this development. In perusing the discussions I gather that  
>many will still consider people such as myself lazy or stupid for their  
>reticence to learn code.

Ron, there are two very distinct aspects of the no-code Tech license. One is the fact that no CW test is required, and the other is that the written test is considered by many, including myself, to be too easy in relation to the privileges offered. But I, for one, don't blame those who take the test for the quality of the test. If you get your license, you're a ham, simple as that.

>proper conduct. Even if I were interested in sending/receiving code, I  
>would rather spend my limited time learning the intricacies of computer  
>interfacing and translation of Morse code. (I have been using ASCII  
>coded alpha-numerics in computer programming for years without the need  
>to memorize the actual numerical codes!)

Based on your desire to learn and experiment, I would welcome you into the hobby. Without learning a single dit or dah, you will have access to the wide open spaces of ham radio. (But, honestly, you really don't

know the ASCII for, e.g. CR, LF, ESC, SPACE, etc? :- )

>It is worrisome that many of the HAM community hold the attitude that  
>their activity must be protected from the great "unwashed" masses --

It depends on what you mean by "unwashed." I think hams should have reasonable technical knowledge and a keen interest in the hobby. I know the second can't be tested, but the first can. I don't think the hobby needs, or benefits from, people who's main desire is to play CB with fancier radios.

> You will need numbers.

Have you seen the figures for new licenses lately?

73,  
Mike, KK6GM

-----  
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 05:17:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
wariat.org!dreaml!jga@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2sjb7v\$593@panix.com>, <2sq5u1\$p9e@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,  
<BS+MfH+.darutter@delphi.com>  
Subject : Re: ARRL Replies to proposed rules on Vanity Calls

David Rutter <darutter@delphi.com> writes:

[some deleted]  
>I was and am for a simple get-in-line proposal with calls issued based on  
>license class.....plain and simple.

Does anyone know a source for the callsigns that will be available?

-j

--  
Jon Anhold N8USK - PGP Key available on request - (jga@dreaml.wariat.org)  
Dreamland Network Systems Cleveland, Ohio  
"Where you come from is gone.. Where you thought you were going to was never  
there, and where you are ain't no good unless you can get away from it."

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #261

\*\*\*\*\*